85-1317

No.

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
FEB 3 1986
JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1985

ROBERT L. TUCKER,

Petitioner,

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

APPENDIX TO THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

ROBERT S. ATKINS
ROBERT S. ATKINS & ASSOCIATES, INC.
208 South LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 263-0701

ROBERT E. BENNETT
120 South LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60603
(312) 236-3309

ROBERT L. TUCKER, Pro Se
208 South LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 332-2088

JOHN C. TUCKER*
2 Colony Trail
Lanexa, Virginia 23089
(804) 966-5048

WILLIAM J. HARTE*
WILLIAM J. HARTE & ASSOCIATES, INC.
111 West Washington Street
Chicago, Illinois 60602
(312) 726-5015

* Counsel of Record

Midwest Law Printing Co., Chicago 60611, (312) 321-0220

INDEX TO APPENDIX

		PAGE
A.	Order of U.S. District Court dated May 9, 1984, directing turn over to counsel for petitioner all matters submitted to the trial court *in camera*; and Justice Department Letter—turning over secretly submitted materials to chambers ...	A-1
B.	Slip Opinion filed by the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit on September 6, 1985 ...	B-1
C.	Two-part letter of Irving Pheterson to Mary Stowell, Assistant U.S. Attorney	C-1
D.	Order of Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, *sua sponte*, December 30, 1985, *United States ex rel. Frank Teague v. Michael Lane*, No. 84-2474	D-1
E.	Order of Court of Appeals dated December 5, 1985 denying motion for rehearing *en banc* and Motion of Petitioner to vacate said order ...	E-1
F.	Order of Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, denying petitioner's motion to vacate Order of December 5, 1985, denying petition for rehearing *en banc*, and consolidate this cause with *Teague*, January 28, 1986	F-1
G.	Summary order, November 7, 1985, denying leave to the President of the Cook County Bar Association, joined in by the Dean of Northwestern School of Law, to file an amicus statement	G-1
H.	Summary order, November 19, 1985, denying leave to Chicago Bar Association to file an amicus statement	H-1
I.	Motion of Chicago Bar Association to file amicus statement	I-1

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1985

ROBERT L. TUCKER,

Petitioner,

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

APPENDIX TO THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

APPENDIX A

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

ROBERT L. TUCKER,

Defendant.

No. 82 CR 253—Judge Kocoras

ORDER

THIS MATTER COMING ON TO BE HEARD on the motion of defendant Robert Tucker, joined by defendants Deborah Bell and Michael Bell, by their respective counsel, and the Court being fully advised in the premises,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. The government shall provide to counsel for defendants by 5:00 P.M. on Thursday, May 10, 1984, a copy of all materials submitted to the Court *in camera*, in connection with the trial of this cause, which materials relate to information provided to the government by or about James Gunnelles.

2. The government shall provide to counsel for defendants by 5:00 P.M. on Thursday, May 10, 1984 a list of all additional materials supplied to the Court by the government, *in camera*, in connection with the trial of this

cause, which list shall identify the source of the document and describe, in general terms, the subject matter of the submission.

3. The government shall provide counsel for defendants, by 5:00 P.M. on Thursday, May 10, 1984, a copy of the following additional documents which were submitted to the Court, by the government, *in camera*, in connection with the trial of this cause:

4. Access to the documents ordered to be produced by the government in paragraphs 1 through 3 above shall be limited to the defendants and their counsel, and the contents of said documents shall not be disclosed or disseminated by them to any other person. To the extent that counsel for defendants deem it necessary to make reference to the contents of any of the aforementioned documents in their reply brief in the United States Court of Appeals, beyond those portions of the contents of said documents which have already been disclosed of record in this case, counsel for defendants shall provide the government with a copy of the pages of their reply brief which contain any such discussion, and, in the event that the government shall so request, that portion of defendants' reply briefs shall be submitted to the Court of Appeals under seal, together with a copy of this order and a request that the Court of Appeals retain that portion of the reply brief under seal.

ENTER:

/s/ Charles P. Kocoras
United States District Judge

Dated: May 9, 1984

(Letterhead of)
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
United States Attorney
Northern District of Illinois

DCM:kfr

United States Courthouse
Chicago, Illinois 60604

May 10, 1984

HAND DELIVER

Richard P. Steinken
Jenner & Block
One IBM Plaza
Chicago, Illinois 60611

John A. Dienner, III
Pierce, Lydon, Griffin
and Montana
18th Floor
100 West Monroe Street
Chicago, Illinois 60603

Aviva Meridian Kaiser
IIT/Chicago-Kent College
of Law
77 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606

Re: *United States v. Robert Tucker, Deborah Bell, and Michael Ball*, No. 82 CR 253

Gentlemen and Ms. Kaiser:

Pursuant to the district court's order entered in the above-named case on May 9, 1984, the following items are enclosed:

1. Letter from Assistant United States Attorney Stowell to Judge Kocoras, dated October 15, 1982, tendering grand jury materials with government's theory of the case;
2. Notification dated December 1, 1982, of Portia McKinney's brief service on the grand jury which later returned the indictment in this case;
3. December 8, 1982, submission of FBI internal communication relating information FBI received from James Gunnells concerning possible bad acts of others; and
4. December 14, 1982, submission of FBI internal communications relating information received from James Gunnells.

The two remaining *in camera* submissions relate to:

1. December 1, 1982, submission advising that a government witness was investigated for an alleged bad act having nothing to do with this case, and that the investigation was closed with no arrests or charges; and
2. December 8, 1982, submission of FBI internal communications concerning a government witness' work record between 1970-1976, and alleged bad act in 1972, investigated with negative results, and having nothing to do with this case.

Very truly yours,

DAN K. WEBB
United States Attorney

By: /s/ MARY STOWELL
Assistant United States Attorney

Enc.

APPENDIX B

IN THE
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

Nos. 83-1438, 83-1439, 83-1444

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

ROBERT L. TUCKER, DEBORAH BELL,
and MICHAEL BALL,

Defendants-Appellants.

Appeals from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division.
No. 82 CR 253—**Charles P. Kocoras**, *Judge.*

ARGUED MAY 25, 1984—DECIDED SEPTEMBER 6, 1985

Before POSNER and COFFEY, *Circuit Judges*, and CAMPBELL, *Senior District Judge.**

POSNER, *Circuit Judge.* Michael Ball, Deborah Bell, and Robert Tucker were tried together for wire fraud (see 18 U.S.C. § 1343) and for submitting false statements to a federally insured bank (18 U.S.C. § 1014); were convicted by a jury; and were sentenced to prison terms of 9 months (Ball), 15 months (Tucker), and 2 years (Bell), plus periods of probation and, in the case of Bell and Tucker, were also ordered to make restitution of $5 million, subject to certain conditions. All three defendants appeal, raising a variety of questions.

* Hon. William J. Campbell of the Northern District of Illinois, sitting by designation.

The scheme charged by the government worked as follows. Bell, a commodities broker in Chicago, with the aid of Ball, a freight forwarder in Miami, and Tucker, who was Bell's lawyer, made a contract to sell 6,000 tons of beans to Guatemala for $5 million. Bell did not have the beans, of course; she was a middleman; to get the beans she turned to Irving Pheterson, a commodities broker in Miami who had a supplier in the Far East. The contract with Guatemala was to be paid for by a letter of credit issued by a Guatemalan bank and confirmed by the Continental Illinois National Bank in Chicago. Under the terms of the letter of credit, the Continental Bank would pay Bell for the beans upon receipt of documents showing that th y had been loaded on board ship in Hong Kong en route to Guatemala, and Bell would then reimburse Pheterson. So the beans would go from Hong Kong to Guatemala, while payment would go from the Continental Bank to Bell to Pheterson. The letter of credit made the Continental Bank in effect the payment agent of the Guatemalan buyer.

Documents showing that the beans had been loaded were presented to the bank, and the bank paid the letter of credit. But the documents had been forged; the beans had not been (and never were) shipped. Pheterson testified under a grant of immunity that the three defendants had forged the documents. There is no question the documents were forged; the question is by whom. The defendants argue that Pheterson was the real architect of the fraud and testified against them to save his own skin. The government's theory was different: that since the letter of credit had not been made transferable, the defendants could not assign it to someone as collateral for a loan that would enable them to buy the beans needed to fulfill the contract, see generally White & Summers, Handbook of the Law Under the Uniform Commercial Code 747-51 (2d ed. 1980), and had turned to forgery to get the money they needed to buy the beans.

The substantive issue in this appeal, an issue apparently of first impression, is whether a letter of credit is within the scope of 18 U.S.C. § 1014, which punishes false statements made to influence a bank's action "upon any

application, advance, discount, purchase, purchase agreement, repurchase agreement, commitment, or loan." The false statements in this case were made to induce the Continental Bank to deposit $5 million in the defendants' account. The transaction fits comfortably within the statutory terms "application," "advance," and "commitment." The bank was obligated to pay Bell upon presentation of the required documents. This was a commitment; and the forged documents were in support of an "application" designed to induce the bank to honor its "commitment" and "advance" funds to the applicants.

Williams v. United States, 458 U.S. 279 (1982), on which the defendants rely, is inapposite. The Court held that check-kiting does not violate section 1014, because merely depositing a check that is not backed by funds is not a false statement. See *id.* at 284-85. The defendants in this case made explicit representations which were false in order to get Continental Bank to part with $5 million. Although we can find no cases under section 1014 involving letters of credit, our conclusion that a fraudulent representation made to induce the bank to pay the beneficiary violates the section is supported by analogy to several cases decided after *Williams*: *United States v. Price*, 763 F.2d 640, 643 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Davis*, 730 F.2d 669, 673 (11th Cir. 1984); *United States v. Shaid*, 730 F.2d 225, 232 (5th Cir. 1984); *Prushinowski v. United States*, 562 F. Supp. 151, 156-58 (S.D.N.Y. 1983).

We next consider the sufficiency of the evidence to convict. Pheterson was, as the judge remarked, an unreliable witness, not only because he had an incentive to shift the responsibility for the fraud to the defendants but because his testimony contained contradictions and memory lapses, and, more seriously, because there is evidence that he is mentally impaired (more on this shortly). Nevertheless there is no serious question about the guilt of Bell and Ball, at least. Fingerprint and handwriting evidence, statements to third parties, testimony from bean suppliers, and the testimony of Tucker's secretary corroborate Pheterson's testimony against them.

Although there is more question about Tucker's guilt, we are persuaded that a reasonable jury could find sufficient corroboration of Pheterson's testimony to convict Tucker, even if the jury maintained as it should have done a healthy skepticism about Pheterson's honesty and recollection. Among the documents submitted to the bank on September 5, 1980, to get the letter of credit paid was one that certified that the beans were on board ship in Hong Kong. But shortly afterward Tucker got approval for a letter of credit to pay for beans to fulfill the contract. This shows that Tucker knew the document was false, albeit after the document had been submitted to the bank. Some of his secretary's testimony indicated that Tucker was present when questionable documents were being prepared (for example, a phony bill of lading for the beans purportedly shipped from Hong Kong), and she testified to statements made by him that were consistent with guilty knowledge. And Tucker wrote checks to himself for a total of $68,000 from an account in which the letter of credit had been deposited. These payments ostensibly were to repay a loan he had made to facilitate the transaction, but even so this suggests that his role was entrepreneurial, and not just that of a lawyer (his theory). Although apart from Pheterson's testimony the evidence fell far short of proving Tucker's participation in the fraud beyond a reasonable doubt—most of it being consistent with his playing just a lawyer's role—the significance of the other evidence is that it corroborates Pheterson's testimony. Ordinarily a jury can convict on the basis of a single eyewitness's testimony, but we may assume that where the witness was as unreliable as Pheterson there would have to be some corroboration. There was.

We turn now to the alleged procedural errors at the trial. The district judge refused to order a psychiatric examination of Pheterson or conduct a hearing on his competence to testify, and the defendants argue that this was error because Pheterson (they argue) obviously had serious mental problems. For reasons discussed in *United*

States v. Gutman, 725 F.2d 417, 420 (7th Cir. 1984), and unnecessary to repeat here, we hesitate to reverse a district judge's refusal to order that a witness submit to a psychiatric examination; and there was no abuse of discretion by the judge in this case. The defendants make much—too much—of the fact that in 1978, two years before the event in issue, Pheterson had brought a personal-injury suit, later dismissed, in which he claimed to have suffered brain damage as a result of being exposed to dry-ice fumes (i.e., carbon dioxide); of his subsequent statements that the carbon-dioxide poisoning had caused an impairment of his memory; and of a letter that Pheterson wrote to an assistant United States attorney in which he discussed the conflict between his "oversoul" and his "undersoul." In fact there is no indication that Pheterson had suffered significant brain damage caused by dry-ice fumes or anything else (he was conducting business as usual two years after bringing that suit), or that he had any mental illness, though he admitted that he had a problem remembering things—a type of problem too common, however, to be suggestive of a mental disease or defect that psychiatry might elucidate. The letter in question is rambling, weird, but not demented. The reference to a conflict between the "oversoul" and the "undersoul"—between what Freudian psychologists call the superego and the id, and what laymen a generation ago called one's "good angel" and one's "bad angel"—is not evidence of mental illness. The letter was a rough draft that Pheterson was reluctant to turn over to the assistant United States attorney; and many rough drafts, like the unedited thoughts that run through people's minds, are pretty strange. Although the defendants' psychiatric expert said that Pheterson's brain injuries and statements were consistent with "Organic Amnestic Syndrome," "one of the major symptoms of [which] is confabulation, the recitation of imaginary events to fill in gaps in memory," many minor symptoms are "consistent" with major diseases; a cough is consistent with lung cancer. All the record of this case shows is a troubled and

evasive witness desperate for immunity and selective and self-justifying in his recollections. It does not show a man who is demented, and the judge was not required to force him to submit to an examination by a psychiatrist. Cf. *United States v. Eschweiler*, 745 F.2d 435, 438 (7th Cir. 1984). The witness in *Gutman*, in contrast, had a long history of serious mental illness.

The letter we have just mentioned is a main prop of the defendants' claim that the government pressured Pheterson to tell the government's version of the events constituting the fraud, regardless of what he actually believed, by dangling immunity bait; for the letter ends: "Every time I start to writing I feel that I am not 'saying it right' so I tear it up and start over. I hope this is what you need. Please advise. Thank you." But Pheterson had given the outline of his story in connection with a civil suit before being subpoenaed by the grand jury; the letter from which we have quoted is consistent with Pheterson's simply having found it difficult to set forth the entire complicated story in a coherent form; and the assistant United States attorney to whom the letter was addressed repeatedly adjured Pheterson to tell the truth.

Tucker also objects to the judge's refusing to let him introduce the letter into evidence as an exhibit. The letter was incorrectly excluded as hearsay. It would have been hearsay if offered to show the truth of what it contained, but it was not hearsay when offered to undermine the writer's credibility as a witness. Though we ourselves are not troubled by the discussion in the letter of the war between Pheterson's "oversoul" and "undersoul," the jury was entitled to consider the letter as evidence that, as the defendants argued, Pheterson was an unreliable witness. But the error in excluding the letter from the documentary evidence in the case was harmless. The defendants used the letter to cross-examine Pheterson, so that much of it was read to the jury. It was used, of course, to undermine Pheterson's credibility, which is the only pur-

pose for which Tucker wanted the letter used. We cannot imagine that the jury would have reached a different result by having the letter to reread in the jury room with the extensive other documents in the case.

Tucker objects to the district court's refusal to admit the results of a lie-detector test which he had taken and passed. In this circuit the admissibility of lie-detector test results has thus far been left to the discretion of the trial judge. *United States v. Williams*, 737 F.2d 594, 611 (7th Cir. 1984). Perhaps some day we will have to lay down circuit-wide policy on the question but this is not the case in which to do so. Tucker refused to agree before he took the lie-detector test that the results, whatever they were, could be used in evidence. Such a refusal could well make lie-detector test results unreliable. See *United States v. Feldman*, 711 F.2d 758, 767 (7th Cir. 1983); but see Raskin, Barland & Podlesny, *Validity and Reliability of Detection of Deception* 6, 21-22, 24-25 (Natl. Inst. of Law Enforcement and Crim. Justice, June 1978). The lie detector does not peer into the mind; it is a test of (relative) anxiety, and if the person taking the test has nothing to lose and everything to gain, he may not be anxious and his passing the test may prove nothing. Whatever the force of this doubt, it is readily alleviated by agreeing to allow the government to put the test results, whatever they may be, into evidence if it wants; and a defendant who refuses to make such an agreement is in a poor position to challenge the district court's exercise of its discretion to refuse to admit the results.

Tucker also complains about the district judge's refusal to let him address the jury in closing argument. Tucker is a lawyer and could if he had wanted have represented himself (of course he could have done so even if he were not a lawyer), but in fact he had three lawyers at trial and his own participation as counsel was minimal. The judge was concerned that since the jury had seen Tucker as a defendant, not as a defense lawyer, it would

be confused if he addressed it in closing argument; the jury would think it was being addressed by a defendant, not by a lawyer. Tucker had declined to testify, thus sparing himself cross-examination. To allow him to address the jury would in effect have allowed him to testify without being subject to cross-examination. This is the same "heads I win, tails you lose" tactic that Tucker attempted with the lie-detector test. The judge did not abuse his discretion by not allowing Tucker to address the jury.

Next the defendants complain about certain documents that the government submitted to the district judge *in camera*. The documents consisted of reports from a confidential government informant on other misdeeds of the defendants, and the purpose of the submission—the ostensible purpose anyway—was to make sure the government was not required to give any of this information to the defendants. The judge ruled that it was not exculpatory, and the defendants argue that the real purpose was to poison the judge's mind against them. But we think the government acted prudently, since if it had not submitted the documents for the judge's inspection it might have opened itself up to a later attack for violating the defendants' rights under the doctrine of *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83, 87-88 (1963), and *United States v. Agurs*, 427 U.S. 97, 112-13 (1976). As for poisoning the judge's mind, that is a ridiculous suggestion. Anytime a judge grants a motion to suppress evidence against the defendant, it means the judge is in possession of damaging evidence that the jury will not see; and yet we do not on that account require that the trial be conducted before another judge, who is innocent of this evidence. We trust our judges to preside impartially over trials in which they know much that the jury does not know adverse to the defendants; there is no indication that the district judge failed to do his duty in this case.

The defendants also argue that the prosecutor improperly used four of his seven peremptory challenges to

exclude all four black veniremen from the jury, with the result that the jury was all white. Whether the exercise of peremptory challenges on racial grounds violates a criminal defendant's rights when there is no suggestion that the prosecutor's office follows a policy of racial exclusion (that is, uses racially motivated peremptory challenges systematically, and not just occasionally) is an issue now before the Supreme Court. See *Batson v. Kentucky*, 53 U.S.L.W. 3757 (cert. granted April 23, 1985). However it is resolved, these defendants are unlikely to be helped. For the judge in this case, though not required to do so, asked the prosecutor to explain the basis of the four challenges of blacks, and the judge believed the prosecutor's explanation that the motive was not racial. The prosecutor wanted an educated jury that could understand letters of credit and the other aspects of this complicated commercial transaction, and the four blacks happened to have very little education or commercial experience. The judge did what courts that consider racial peremptory challenges unlawful require the trial judge in these cases to do; he satisfied himself that racial bias had not been responsible for the exclusion of the blacks. See, e.g., *McCray v. Abrams*, 750 F.2d 1113, 1131-33 (2d Cir. 1984). His determination, although challenged by the defendants, was not clearly erroneous, and therefore binds us.

The other grounds for reversal advanced by the defendants have no possible merit.

AFFIRMED.

A true Copy:
Teste:

.....
Clerk of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit

APPENDIX C

Verbatim Two-Part Letter of Irving Pheterson To Mary Stowell, Assistant U.S. Attorney

Dear Mary Stowell,

This letter is in two parts. They were written weeks apart. The delay was caused by my desire to be complete as possible.

Part 1

In response to your comments regarding the completed Proffer that you sent to me, you have told me verbally, your thoughts regarding the Proffer. You have given me an opportunity to add, or expand on the knowledge and experience relating to the events involving (D. Bell, Bob Tucker, Rumex Internation, combined with their business dealings with International Assoc. of Grocers, Inc., myself and other people of Firms between Aug. 19th and Sept. 10, 1980.

You have suggested to me that from your investigation of other people that you have created a possible scenerio of events which led you to believe the following.

The Government of Guatamala issued a Non Transferrable L/C to Rumex International, which meant the Government of Guatamala was led to believe that Rumex either possessed one of the following possibilities.

A. Owned and Possessed the beans and should ship them at will to Guatamala, after which, proper documents, they could cash the L/C at the Continental Bank.

B. That Rumex has sufficient credit or funds to buy the beans and ship them to Guatamala, after which they could negotiate the L/C.

You further state that being that Rumex did not

> 1. Have the beans or 2. Have funds or credit they decided. 3. To create false documents and Negotiate the L/C. 4. Use the funds to buy the beans. 5. Ship the beans to Guatamala. 6. Keep the profit, and you further stated that it was believed—that action would benefit everyone and hurt no one

You have told me that the our Government could grant me immunity, or not use my Proffer information against me in the future. So that the wider I detail my experience in my Proffer the greater the scope of the immunity could cover. Should I however limit my experience in the Proffer and that knowledge was challenged by people of firms in the future, I would then possibly suffer the consequences of revoking the Immunity and or be prosecuted for perjury.

In an effort to respond to your suggestions I am now detailing further information concerning the events hereinbefore discussed.

I must first preface my remarks by explaining that the more I age the more I become knowledgeable of the (Entity or oversoul Relationship) and our Human Creation. If you or the people who will judge the sincerity of my remarks are "aware" of this relationship then my remarks will be easily understood—If however you or the people reading this not "aware" then I will try to state it in simple terms.

1. We experience and gain knowledge and store it on many levels of subconsciousness

2. The (illeg.) and (illeg.) is directly related to our Physical Being Survival Pattern too. (This is similar to the BLOCKING of Horrible events that the mind cannot (illeg.) and continue to function normally)

3. (illeg.) which we believe to be beneficial to our Physical Being, But violate the emotional well being of our oversoul are stored in the deep recesses of the mine and other events (illeg.) which the oversoul will not consider a violation of the (illeg.) principal.

4. At some later time in our "present" lifetime or in a "later" life the oversoul will deal with the "lesson" to be learned from that event.

Mary, by your personal visits and by our phone conversations you have started an "opening" in the process of Revealing the information relating to the aforementioned events

1. First to myself
2. Second to the ability to write these remarks
3. Third to my fellow Partners to whom I can only now verbalize the occurances and action, which would hopefully not involve them in any wrong doings.

I now feel my oversoul has "allowed" me to write this narrative because the threatening conditions have been removed. The ensuing information has been revealed to me only a little at a time.

Debra Bell did in fact over a period of time, by phones calls and in person outline her general plan. The information was not given to me in one statement, But rather like a puzzle which I put together (This is the information I have received from my subconcious)

The Reason I never spoke about it to my associates or family has been outlined herin before,

I (illeg.) wondered then as I wonder now why she confided her "plans to (illeg.)

1. She cashed the 1/c with bob Tucker not me.
2. She prepared the forged papers with Bob Tucker in his office with his employees on his typwriter not mine.
3. I could not help her with the papers as This was the first time I had ever seen an 1/c. She on the other hand had years of experience with 1/c's
4. She could have used any stationary not mine and the bank would have paid regardless of name on the billhead
5. The various "Certificates" she proported to be from foreign Countries were made on plain typing paper from Bob Tuckers office, not mine.

6. She made a series of errors in dates. citys. amounts etc. she never bothered to ask me to coach her.

It occurs to me now that she was preparing me and my associates for her alibi. And to blame us. if her plan would go wrong, she could then muddy or cloud her actions with the excuse that we was in someway responsible and she could claim, that she was an innocent party and was duped by us—

My oversoul "perhaps" allowed me to prepare, and limit my Physical actions to the Aug 15th agreement which I took to Chicago and used as a guide line for my Physical Actions. The thin line of awareness with my phyical conduct and the emotional retreats of my mind has caused me Trematic experiences until this day and as I write. I am sorry for my associates who now must defend themselves from a lawsuit by Debra Bell.

Part of the reason I am able to remember is, Because of all of the conversation that goes on these days between all the parties. I Basically believed we were "used" by Debra Bell for Two Reasons.

1. As I said before, as an alibi at a future time if she could create a plausable chain of events to draw the pressure away from her.

2/ As a source to buy the beans if and when she had the money.

I do not believe she "used" me as a teacher to forge Documents—she may have seized upon the opportunity to "use" Mike Ball when she was presented the opportunity.

You have raised a point in one of our conversations was I invited to be an active partner in her scheme with division of profits and Risks an all levels—my answer is obviously no. as I will discribe below.

1. If I were faced with the problem of non transferable l/c I would have devised a legal remedy. to have NON TRANSFERABLE CLAUSE in the l/c. I would have formed another Rumex Internation Corp. in Hong Kong—Then

I would have invited Pantex and Rumex - International Assoc. of Grocers and the Primary shipper, to take stock in the new Corp, proportionately with there financial interest, or value in the deal. Then the primary owner of the beans could ship the beans and all the interested parties could go to the Continental Bank, cash the 1/c with everyone present and divide the proceeds. This would be absolutely legal and in full accord with the 1/c because the documents would be legalized and there would be all winners and no losers.

2. If how ever I were invited to join her scheme on the illegal basis (which I know my oversoul would not have permitted) than in that unlikely event I would certainly not have let her control 96% of the funds and my self to control 4% of the funds. (4% is $198,000.00).

I believe it will become important for us to expand on the nature of the Human Psyche in the Future As I understand it, some People call it their soul or oversoul or entity, we were all formed or created by ALL THAT IS who is of course our creator. I struggle daily with the duties and responsibilities of a father, and husband in order to build a stable and good life. I believe that people keep Experiences and Knowledge in the deep recesses of the sub-conciouss levels of their minds out of reach or touch with the daily active concious awareness. But our oversouls guides us by "impulses" and our dreams, which puts us in touch with our past, and future and so we are enabled to form the events of the present. I believe our thoughts are chanelled through creative avenues which are opened to our physical being by our oversouls, so as not to violate it's perfect state of grace.

Knowing Our society of Human Species however, I think there is also a compainon (under-soul) or (devil) who fights tooth and nail with in all of us for possesion of our physical reality. This would account for the disasters in peoples lives when they become involved in crime, murder and the like. Fortunately I have been dominated by the oversoul not the undersoul in my present physical life.

I am extremely relieved that I can now share with you what you have been pressing for I hope you can understand that I could not give you a simple yes or no answer before, when you were interested not in my observeable actions, but rather in my deep emotional thoughts.

The foregoing statement was written, partially 4 weeks ago I did not send it then because I felt more information was in my mind, and had to come out. The following statement is a continuation of the events as they surface.

Part 2

Dear Mary Stowell

I have read your version of our talks and I have answered you partially in Part 1 I now feel I must make additional comments.

1. I believe some information in your letter was omitted.
2. Some information was out of sequence.
3. The language used could have slightly different meanings.

The entire episode must be discussed as a whole, not specific sentences with a definite yes and no answer, in order to get at the heart of the EVENTS. Debra Bell asked me to work on many deals not just one. I will try to remember as many as I can.

1. 10,000 Mt. Skim Milk Powder from Belgium to Guatamala
2. 6,000 Mt. Black Beans for Guatamala.
3. 50,000 Mt. Yellow Corn for Africa.
4. 6,000 Mt. Lentils
5. 10,000 Mt. Black Beans for Guatamala.
6. 10,000 Mt. Red Beans for Mexico
7. 10,000 Mt. Black Beans for Guatamala.

These are rough estimates as I remember. She then created a variety of payment methods and abilities according to the different buyers. Some were very involved while others were simple. Some needed to be developed in stages, several needed sample documents, as I have outlined to you. Whenever I expressed concern about the legality that could involve me and my associates, even with my limited passive participation. she would say "Oh forget about that deal I've got that covered, what I really meant was this Deal.

I had a gut feeling that she was doing something wrong. Right from the first phone call. Thats why I outlined the limits of my participation in the Aug 15th agreement and I stuck to it.

THE GOALS I SET FOR THE TRIP TO CHICAGO WAS

1. Debra Bell promised me $5,000.00 weather or not the deal was made during the trip on any of the possible sales.

2. I believed I would learn the names of the buyers so I would be advancing (illeg.) in the International Business.

3. Hopefully we would be paid our commision and receive an L/C for a customer and complete my first deal.

You asked me questions concerning a set of documents that Debra presented to the bank for payment, you have told me my answer was not consistent with other information you got from your investigation. From your prospective you are probably right. But from my reality I cannot be positive of my knowledge, because at that time I was considering many options and I could only guess at what Debra's true intent was. There was many sets of Documents she prepared for other deals that she may have tried to collect on, from other L/C's in other banks. You must understand there was a flurry of activity in Bob Tucker's office. Present was myself -Mike Ball Debra Bell -Bob Tucker- 3Secretaries-2other Lawyers 4 Men from Guatamala. The activity did not just center around

one deal with one L/C and one Bank and one set of documents as you seem to think occurred. So when you ask NOW what was my knowledge of what she was doing with the documents the day she cashed the L/C with Continental Bank. As you can well imagine, this is almost impossible to answer because the activity I observed or felt was happening was only guess work at that time. Your question to me is, did I believe the documents prepared by Debra Bell and Bob Tucker were capable of being accepted by the bank as genuine. To that my answer is no. The reason for this is more completely listed in Mr. Fields suit against the bank. I believe there were over 15 Errors the Bank overlooked or choose to disregard.

Your other question is, was I conciously aware of Debra Bell's intentions to use the "sample" documents as an aid in presenting the L/C for payment. With hindsight I could certainly say yes, because I am faced with the reality of the facts as they have been surfacing. But at the time my step by step "Dance" as it was being acted out with Debra Bell that my Knowledge of her thoughts- Movements-intentions-plans-schemes etc- was obscured by.

1. Her own shifts in deals and "stories" with endless Divisions, coupled with her dangling "carrots" of New deals and changing subjects in a second.

2. But I stuck to the goals I set out to do, and to the limitations of my participations as outlined in the Aug. 15th agreement. I felt like a Zombie or a Robot, not wanting to sway from my course of action—Most of all I relegated to my subconscious anything that began to sound wrong. I felt that if my actions were legal, Than I could not Jepardize my associates and my self in any wrong doing.

I realize now that Debra Bell is a MASTER of contriving and MANIPULATING events, situations and the people she wishes to place in them.

I remember severals times "play acting ROLES" for my my own benefit. She started a Discussion regarding "creating false documents" That time I played the role to the

hilt, pretending to be a willing participant in her scheme. At that point I was interested in seeing how she fabricated a LEGAL ending to that particular scenerio. I even made calls to various people with her and Bob Tucker listening in on extentions, one of those calls was to Stanley Upin in New York, I tried to enlist his aid in getting false "sample" documents, they both listened in on the phone as we spoke I had since regreted the incident on my part. Because this is probably how she found out who my supplier was in Hong Kong, She could easily trace the names in the conversation later.

There were other playacting regarding other 1/c's with other products which are unrelated to your present investigation.

I suppose I could write a Book about my thoughts before- during- and now after the whole affair. Everyone seems to think I might have acted *more* wisely, my associates are reminding me almost every time I see them that I have to repay them someday for the legal expenses and time that they are spending to defend themselves from Debra Bell's *ridiculous lawsuit*

I must comment on Debra Bell's defense as I read in the papers she served on me. I really lack the words to fully discribe the shock and indignation and the RAGE THAT ENGULFS ME as I read how she says her role was only "passive and minor in Nature" and it was my wrong doing which led her astray. Words of my true feelings flood my mind in rapid succession, I have to hold them back for now—BUT THE TIME WILL COME when they will pour like a TYPHOON upon her conciousness—and the RAGE within me will be unleashed at the very CORE OF HER SOUL. I simply cannot let the monstrosity of the words of defense, go unprotested to say the least.

I am sure NOW, that I must have been aware of Debra Bell's intent to use the sample documents as valid documents and cash them at the Continental Bank. What started as a fairly simple deal developed into a complicated puzzle in my mind. I told you of the incident in

the restaurant when Debra Blew up and told me to "hit the road" when I started to probe her too deeply about a matter that she did'nt want to talk about. But at this point I'm glad I could get it down on paper. Although as I reread my 3 statements to you plus the one I gave to Mr. Fields, I can see some contridictions in my statements. I'm sure you understand the confused circumstances and how they occured in the maze and webs woven by Debra Bell. I probably should have recalled my earlier statements (if that is possible) and started from scratch But on second thought the way things emergeged from my mind and in the interest of saving time I am going to let things stand Because I only wrote them with the Knowledge and Experience I was aware of at the time that I wrote them. I suppose as things surface I will remember other details-

I am sorry for the long delay on my part in responding. Aside from the problem of making a living which is not going well at all. Every time I start to writing I feel that I am not "saying it right" so I tear it up and start over. I hope this is what you need. Please advise Thank-you

Sincerly

/s/ Irving Pheterson

APPENDIX D

IN THE
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 84-2474

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ex rel. FRANK TEAGUE,

Petitioner-Appellant,

v.

MICHAEL P. LANE, Director, Department of Corrections and MICHAEL O'LEARY, Warden, Stateville Correctional Center,

Respondents-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division.
No. 84 C 1934—**William T. Hart,** *Judge.*

Circulation Under Circuit Rule 16(e)
with Respect to Rehearing En Banc

DECEMBER 30, 1985

Before CUMMINGS, *Chief Judge,* BAUER, WOOD, CUDAHY, POSNER, COFFEY, FLAUM, EASTERBROOK, and RIPPLE, *Circuit Judges.*

ORDER

This case was argued on April 9, 1985 to a panel consisting of Judges Cudahy and Coffey, together with Senior Circuit Judge John W. Peck of the Sixth Circuit, sitting by designation.

Pursuant to Circuit Rule 16(e), the panel opinion in this case was circulated to all the judges of the court in regular active service. A majority of the judges in regular active service have voted to rehear this case *en banc*, the time of argument to be set at a date convenient to the court.

CUDAHY, *Circuit Judge*, dissenting:

This case involves the question whether the Constitution prohibits prosecutors from using their peremptory challenges to exclude potential jurors exclusively on the basis of race. The matter was originally heard by a panel consisting of Judge Coffey, Senior Circuit Judge John W. Peck of the Sixth Circuit, sitting by designation, and me. The panel opinion, which I wrote, vacated and remanded on the grounds that the exercise of peremptory challenges by the prosecutor in this case violated, at least prima facie, the defendant's Sixth Amendment right to an impartial jury. The panel opinion, together with a dissent by Judge Coffey, was then circulated under our Circuit Rule 16 to the full court, which voted to rehear the matter *en banc*. I shall briefly outline here the essential content of the opinion of the panel majority to indicate why I believe that *en banc* review is unnecessary. Judge Peck has requested that I record his agreement with the views which follow.

Frank Teague, a black, was tried before a jury in an Illinois court and convicted of attempted murder and armed robbery. Each side had ten peremptory challenges and the state exercised all of its challenges to exclude black

jurors. The defense also challenged one black, and there were no blacks on the resulting jury.

The defense moved for a mistrial, arguing that the state was denying Teague a trial by a jury of his peers by excluding potential jurors on the basis of race. These motions were denied. Although, as things now stand, a prosecutor need not defend his peremptory challenges, the state offered two rationales for its actions: that it was attempting to obtain a balance of men and women on the jury and that it had excused a number of young people. The Illinois Appellate Court noted that the record did not support the state's explanation but held that under existing law it could place no restriction on a prosecutor's use of his peremptory challenges.

The precise issue raised was whether a defendant's Sixth Amendment rights are violated when a prosecutor uses his peremptory challenges to exclude members of one race from a petit jury. Such a use is not a violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, so long as the exclusion does not prevent members of a race from *ever* sitting on juries, "in case after case, whatever the circumstances, whatever the crime, and whoever the defendant or victim may be." *Swain v. Alabama*, 380 U.S. 202, 223 (1965). *Swain* was clearly decided on equal protection grounds and, although the Court did not question the standing of the defendant Swain, the rights asserted and addressed by the Court were in large measure the rights of blacks who were prevented from serving as jurors. But the right to sit on a jury is quite distinct from the right of a defendant to be tried by a jury from which members of his race have not been systematically excluded.

The Fourteenth Amendment guarantees due process as well as equal protection, but at the time *Swain* was decided it was not yet settled which jury-trial rights were guaranteed by that amendment's due process clause. We now know that the Sixth Amendment applies fully to the states through the Fourteenth Amendment, *Duncan v.*

Louisiana, 391 U.S. 145 (1968); what has not been resolved is whether the Sixth Amendment guarantees the right to a jury from which eligible jurors have not been excluded because of their race. This question was raised but not decided in two recent cases in this circuit. *See United States v. Clark*, 737 F.2d 679 (7th Cir. 1984) (facts of case failed to raise presumption of racial motivation); *United States ex rel. Palmer v. DeRobertis*, 738 F.2d 168 (7th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 105 S. Ct. 306 (1984) (habeas petitioner waived objection by failing to raise it in state court). Other circuits have split on the question, *compare Weathersby v. Morris*, 708 F.2d 1497 (9th Cir. 1983), *and United States v. Childress*, 715 F.2d 1313 (8th Cir. 1983) (no Sixth Amendment right), *with McCray v. Adams*, 750 F.2d 113 (2d Cir. 1984), *and Booker v. Jabe*, No. 83-1136 (6th Cir. Oct. 29, 1985), and the Supreme Court has heard oral argument on this question in an appeal from a state supreme court, *Batson v. Kentucky*, 105 S. Ct. 2111 (1985).

As Judge Peck and I have viewed it, the question presents a clash between two devices, the peremptory challenge and the requirement of representativeness in the jury pool, both of which are intended to secure an impartial jury and neither of which we wanted to see destroyed. For the most part they do not conflict, but when they do, one must give way partially so that neither will be destroyed.

The Sixth Amendment guarantees that the jury pool from which a jury is selected must contain a representative cross-section of the community. *Taylor v. Louisiana*, 419 U.S. 522 (1975). The representativeness requirement does not extend directly to the petit jury—no defendant can demand a perfect cross-section on his jury—but the fact that there is not a direct connection does not mean that there is no connection at all. If the Sixth Amendment has implications for the jury pool, that can only be because it has some implication for the jury that actually sits at trial. In *Williams v. Florida*, 399 U.S. 78 (1970), the Supreme Court held that a six-person jury was con-

stitutionally acceptable, noting that a jury should be large enough "to promote group deliberation, free from outside attempts at intimidation, and to provide a *fair possibility for obtaining a representative cross-section* of the community." *Id.* at 100 (emphasis added). In *Ballew v. Georgia*, 435 U.S. 223 (1978), it held that a five-person jury was not, expressing concern about "the ability of juries truly to represent the community as membership decreases below six." *Id.* at 242. Although the Sixth Amendment does not guarantee a representative trial jury, it does appear to guarantee the *possibility* of a representative jury. In the absence of that possibility, the negative effect upon defendants who belong to the group excluded is not difficult to imagine; it will be especially severe where the group suffers from community prejudice. Judge Peck and I thought it beyond dispute, therefore, that the Sixth Amendment's protection lies in its requirement that the state cannot interfere with the possibility that the jury will be representative.

There is no constitutional right to peremptory challenges, *Swain*, 380 U.S. at 219, but the peremptory challenge has a long history, serves an important function and should not lightly be narrowed. The peremptory challenge allows each side to eliminate jurors whom it suspects, for reasons it cannot articulate or for reasons not reaching the level of cause, of being partial to the other side. With peremptory challenges, the resulting jury should be closer to the ideal of a body without sympathies for either side. And yet the peremptory challenge may conflict with the goal of securing to each defendant the possibility of a representative jury, for with enough peremptory challenges, a prosecutor can, if he chooses, make sure that members of a minority group do not appear on any jury where their presence would be a hindrance to him.

Judge Peck and I therefore believed that the only option open to the court in these circumstances was to limit the peremptory challenge in some way. We did not believe that this mechanism for insuring jury impartiality would

be destroyed if abuses of it were made subject to objection. We therefore suggested a limitation that we think would be the least intrusive while complying with the demands of the Sixth Amendment. Rather than reduce the number of peremptory challenges, as some have suggested, we sought to limit the prosecutor with a procedure that would screen out only cases of discriminatory abuse. Two circuits have placed such limits on the use of the peremptory challenge to avoid violating the Sixth Amendment. *See Booker v. Jabe, supra,* and *McCray v. Adams, supra.* A number of other circuits have done so as an exercise of their supervisory powers. *See United States v. Leslie,* 759 F.2d 366 (5th Cir. 1985) (*en banc*); *United States v. Jackson,* 696 F.2d 578, 593 (8th Cir. 1982), *cert. denied,* 460 U.S. 1073 (1983). *See also United States v. McDaniels,* 379 F. Supp. 1243, 1249 (E.D. La. 1974). State supreme courts have followed a similar route, *see State v. Neil,* 457 So.2d 481 (Fla. 1984); *Commonwealth v. Soares,* 387 N.E.2d 499 (Mass. 1979); *People v. Wheeler,* 583 P.2d 748 (Cal. 1978).

According to the procedure adopted by these courts and suggested by Judge Peck and me, the defendant would have to raise a timely objection and make out a prima facie case by showing that the persons excluded were members of a cognizable and suspect group and that those challenged were more likely to have been challenged because of the group they belong to than because of any specific bias. Once the prima facie case was made, it would be up to the prosecutor to rebut it. The appropriate rebuttal would involve bias, of course, because bias is supposed to be the reason for the challenges in the first place. The prosecutor's rationale would not have to be one that would sustain a challenge for cause, but it would have to be both race-neutral and supported by the record. This procedure would not prevent the prosecutor from excluding two, or three, or four on the basis of race; but it would prevent him from either using *all* of his peremptories to exclude members of a race, or from using his peremptories to systematically exclude all members of a

race. All of this would fall short of destroying the peremptory challenge. The prosecutor would be free to use his challenges as he chose, so long as he did not use them for the impermissible purpose of systematically excluding blacks, or members of one cognizable group, from the petit jury.

For these reasons, which seem persuasive, I think *en banc* review unnecessary and I therefore respectfully dissent from the order directing rehearing *en banc.*

A true Copy:

Teste:

Clerk of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit

APPENDIX E

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
For the Seventh Circuit
Chicago, Illinois 60604

December 5, 1985.

Before

Hon. RICHARD A. POSNER, *Circuit Judge*
Hon. JOHN L. COFFEY, *Circuit Judge*
Hon. WILLIAM J. CAMPBELL, *Senior District Judge**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

No. 83-1438 v.

ROBERT L. TUCKER,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division.
No. 82 CR 253—Charles P. Kocoras, *Judge.*

ORDER

On October 10, 1985, defendant-appellant filed a petition for rehearing with suggestion for rehearing *en banc*. All of the judges on the original panel have voted to deny the petition, and none of the active members of the court has requested a vote on the suggestion for rehearing *en banc*. The petition is therefore DENIED.

* Hon. William J. Campbell of the Northern District of Illinois, sitting by designation.

IN THE
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

No. 83-1438 vs.

ROBERT L. TUCKER,

Defendant-Appellant.

On Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division.
No. 82 CR 253
Honorable Charles P. Kocoras, Judge Presiding.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL MOTION TO RECALL AND STAY MANDATE; TO VACATE ORDER OF DECEMBER 5, 1985; TO CONSOLIDATE CAUSES; OR FOR ALTERNATIVE RELIEF

Defendant, ROBERT L. TUCKER, again appearing pro se, by prior leave of this Court granted in September 1985, supplementing the motion for recall and stay of mandate filed herein by Robert S. Atkins, Esq., on December 26, 1985, respectfully states and shows unto the Court as follows:

By motions previously filed herein on and before September 30, 1985, in support of requests for extension of time, and to file an oversized Petition for Rehearing pro

se, this defendant expressly advised the Court that his attorney, John C. Tucker, who was responsible for handling and arguing this defendant's appeal, had left this jurisdiction, was unavailable to this defendant, and had become a permanent resident of the state of Virginia. Thus, this petitioner's request, and this Court's order granting leave to this defendant to appear, on the Petition for Rehearing *En Banc*, pro se. Defendant's formal Pro Se Appearance was filed (See Exhibit-A, attached hereto).

Despite the foregoing, when on December 5, 1985, this Court entered its order denying this defendant's Petition for Rehearing *En Banc*, no copy, or other notice whatsoever, of this Court's order denying relief was provided to this defendant.

As a consequence, on December 21, 1985, this defendant departed the city of Chicago and travelled to the city of Alcoa, Tennessee, without any knowledge of the December 5th adverse action of this Court, to make funeral arrangements for one Sidney Strivision, age 91 years, the foster father of this defendant, who died on December 20, 1985, and who was buried in Alcoa, Tennessee, on December 27, 1985.

This defendant returned to Chicago in the late evening on Monday, December 30, 1985, to be advised by Robert S. Atkins, Esq., for the first time, on Tuesday, December 31, 1985, that this Court had denied this defendant's Petition for Rehearing *En Banc* 26 days earlier, on December 5, 1985. No copy or other notice of this Court's order denying the Petition for Rehearing *En Banc* was received by any lawyer associated with this defendant's appeal until on or about December 23, 1985.

As a result, this defendant has been deprived of more than fifty percent (50%) of the time provided by Rule, within which he would have had a right to file a petition for writ of certiorari with the clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. Robert S. Atkins, upon receiving notice of the issuance of this Court's mandate on December 23, 1985, without any obligation to do so, was kind enough to promptly prepare and file the Motion for Recall and Stay of Mandate, now under consideration by this Court.

Now, in further support of the request for recall and stay of mandate, this defendant respectfully advises the Court, that on Friday, January 3, 1986, this defendant learned, for the first time, that on December 30, 1985, a majority of the active judges of this Court, voted and ordered, Sua Sponte, rehearing *en banc*, in the cause of *United States of America, ex rel, Frank Teague v. Michael P. Lane, Director of Corrections*, et al., U.S. Court of Appeals cause No. 84-2474. The order of December 30, 1985, with dissenting Opinion by Judge Cudahy, concurred in by Senior Circuit Judge John W. Peck, is attached hereto as Exhibit-B.

U.S. ex rel Frank Teague (No. 84-2474), was docketed on behalf of a black state court defendant after, and was pending under consideration by a separate and different panel of this Court, for the full period of 16 months, during which this cause of *U.S. v. Tucker* (No. 83-1438), was pending and under advisement, after oral argument, by the panel that decided this case. Judge Coffey participated as a member of *both* panels; dissenting in *U.S. ex rel Teague* (84-2474).

Both *U.S. ex rel Frank Teague* (84-2474) and *U.S. v. Tucker* (83-1438) raised and vigorously argued, the exact same question (the sole issue in *U.S. ex rel Teague*):

> Whether the conscious striking and exclusion by the prosecution, of black persons, because of their race, from the jury that tried and convicted the black defendants in question, violated the provisions of the Sixth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

The determination of a majority of the appeals panel in *U.S. ex rel Teague* (No. 84-2474), that the conduct of the prosecution violated the defendant's Sixth Amendment

rights, and ordering a *new trial*, and the contrary and inconsistent determination of this panel in *U.S. v. Tucker* (83-1438), in which a professional statistical study and analysis, contained in an affidavit of record herein, concluded that the preemptory striking by the government of all prospective jurors who were black, was based solely on the fact of their race, creates a clear and undeniable "conflict between or among" the judges of the United States Court of Appeals for the 7th Circuit, as well as the acknowledged conflict between and among the several circuits of the United States; and which continuing national conflict was the subject of oral argument before the U.S. Supreme Court on Wednesday, December 11, 1985, in the case of *Baston v. Kentucky*, 105 S.Ct. 2111 (1985).

This continuing conflict, and national strain and pull upon the several federal circuit courts, as to this issue, and particularly the now documented conflict within the ranks of the judges of this Court, not only impact upon the legitimate rights of defendants in criminal cases, but strongly confuse and tend to undermine public confidence in the stability of the judicial process.

Propriety, consistency and stability of this Court's decisions, as well as fairness and equal protection of the law would seem to warrant recall and staying of the mandate in this cause; the vacating and setting aside of this Court's order of December 5, 1985, denying this defendant's Petition for Rehearing *En Banc*; consolidating this cause with the cause of *U.S. ex rel Frank Teague*, at least with respect to the issue of the conscious exclusion of black persons from trial jury service in each case on the basis of their race, and setting *both* causes No. 84-2474 and No. 83-1438 for rehearing *en banc* at a date convenient to this Court; or, in the alternative, recalling and staying the mandate issued herein and advancing the *effective date* of the order of December 5, 1985, so as to allow this defendant, who is not now represented by counsel, his full and lawful 60 days within which to prepare and timely file his Petition for Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the United States.

This defendant poses no threat to society, and is both anxious and determined to always be available to respond to the processes of this Court. Accordingly, no harm or injury will be visited upon the rights of any party to this cause if the relief requested in the initial submission by Mr. Atkins, and in this supplemental motion is granted.

WHEREFORE, defendant requests the entry of an order recalling and staying the mandate in this cause; vacating and setting aside the order of December 5, 1985, denying this defendant's Petition for Rehearing *En Banc*, consolidating this cause No. 83-1438 with cause No. 84-2474, at least as to the issue of conscious racially motivated jury exclusion, and setting both those causes, and that issue for rehearing *en banc*; or in the alternative, recalling and staying the mandate issued herein, and advancing the *effective date* of the order of December 5, 1985, to a current date so as to allow this defendant his full and lawful 60 days to prepare and timely file his Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Robert L. Tucker
Pro Se
Defendant-Appellant
208 South LaSalle Street, #687
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 332-2088

EXHIBIT-A

APPEARANCE AND CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST

ROBERT L. TUCKER, defendant herein, files the within appearance pro se, and furnishes the following list, in compliance with the provisions of Circuit Rule 5(a) and (b).

(1) PARTY REPRESENTED

Robert L. Tucker, defendant
208 South LaSalle Street, Suite 687
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 332-2088

(2) ATTORNEYS AND LAW FIRMS REPRESENTING THIS DEFENDANT

Robert L. Tucker
Respectfully appears Pro Se

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Robert L. Tucker
Defendant—Petitioner, Pro Se

Dated: September 30, 1985

[EXHIBIT-B omitted in printing—a copy of the Order of the Court of Appeals dated December 30, 1985 is set forth herein at pages D-1 to D-7.]

APPENDIX F

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
For the Seventh Circuit
Chicago, Illinois 60604

January 28, 1986.

Before

Hon. RICHARD A. POSNER, *Circuit Judge*
Hon. JOHN L. COFFEY, *Circuit Judge*
Hon. WILLIAM J. CAMPBELL, *Senior District Judge**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

No. 83-1438 vs.

ROBERT L. TUCKER,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division.
No. 82 CR 253—Judge Charles P. Kocoras.

This matter comes before the court for its consideration upon the "EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL MOTION TO RECALL AND STAY MANDATE; TO VACATE

* Hon. William J. Campbell, Senior Judge, United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, sitting by designation.

ORDER OF DECEMBER 5, 1985; TO CONSOLIDATE CAUSES; OR FOR ALTERNATIVE RELIEF" filed herein on January 28, 1986.

On consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED that the issuance of this court's mandate is further STAYED to and including February 22, 1986.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that appellant's request for advancement of the "effective date" of the court's denial of rehearing is DENIED.

IT IS ALSO FURTHER ORDERED that appellant's request that the order denying rehearing be vacated and that this appeal be consolidated with *U.S. ex rel. Teague v. Lane*, Case No. 84-2474, is DENIED.

APPENDIX G

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
For the Seventh Circuit
Chicago, Illinois 60604

November 7, 1985.

Before
Hon. RICHARD A. POSNER, *Circuit Judge*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

No. 83-1438 vs.

ROBERT L. TUCKER,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division.
No. 82 CR 253—Judge Charles P. Kocoras.

This matter comes before the court for its consideration upon the "MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMICUS CURIAE STATEMENT" filed herein on November 1, 1985.

On consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED that the "MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMICUS CURIAE STATEMENT" is DENIED.

APPENDIX H

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
For the Seventh Circuit
Chicago, Illinois 60604

November 19, 1985.

Before

Hon. RICHARD A. POSNER, *Circuit Judge*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

No. 83-1438 vs.

ROBERT L. TUCKER,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division.
No. 82 CR 253—Judge Charles P. Kocoras.

This matter comes before the court for its consideration upon the "MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMICUS CURIAE STATEMENT" filed herein on November 12, 1985.

On consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED that the "MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMICUS CURIAE STATEMENT" is DENIED.

APPENDIX I

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

No. 83-1438 v.

ROBERT L. TUCKER,

Defendant-Appellant.

On Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division.
No. 82 CR 253
Honorable Charles P. Kocoras, Judge Presiding.

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMICUS CURIAE STATEMENT

As set forth in the attached statement, the Chicago Bar Association* requests leave to file the Amicus Curiae Statement in Support of Petition for Rehearing.

Respectfully submitted,
Chicago Bar Association
/s/ Richard J. Phelan
President
Chicago Bar Association

DATED: November 11, 1985

* On November 7, 1985, the Board of Managers, in an unprecedented action, voted unanimously to authorize filing of this Motion and attached Amicus Curiae Statement on behalf of the Bar Association and its President.

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

No. 83-1438 v.

ROBERT L. TUCKER,

Defendant-Appellant.

On Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division.
No. 82 CR 253
Honorable Charles P. Kocoras, Judge Presiding.

AMICUS CURIAE STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR REHEARING

The Chicago Bar Association ("CBA"), a not-for-profit corporation with more than 18,000 members, was organized in order to promote the due administration of justice and the public good. Because of the CBA's longstanding concern for the integrity of our lawyers and the judicial system, and the appearance of propriety in the administration of justice, the CBA seeks to file this amicus statement in support of a petiton for rehearing *en banc* filed by Robert Tucker. In support thereof, the CBA states the following:

1. The defendant, a respected member of the bar, was found guilty of criminal conduct in an admittedly "close case" in which error occurred in excluding evidence and in which numerous unusual procedures were followed.

2. The defendant's conviction was based on the testimony of a single government witness who was found by the Court to be "unreliable", "troubled", "evasive", "selective and self-justifying in his recollections" and "desperate for immunity".

3. The Court found that the trial court committed error in excluding from evidence a letter written by that same witness to a government attorney but concluded that the error was "harmless".

4. The trial judge refused to hold a pre-trial hearing on the issue of that witness' competency despite the witness' claim that he previously had suffered "brain damage."

5. The government submitted to the trial judge before trial, and without notice to or knowledge of defense counsel, derogatory reports about the defendant, a written statement of the government's case against defendant, along with exhibits and portions of grand jury testimony, and a statement concerning a certain grand jury witness who was excused from the grand jury and who became a witness at the trial.

6. The government used its pre-emptory challenges to exclude all black veniremen from the jury and supposedly justified its exclusion in an *ex parte* meeting with the trial court. The propriety of such exclusion is now at issue before the Supreme Court in *Batson v. Kentucky,* No. 84-6263.

The CBA submits that all of these matters considered together and in the context of a "close case" merit review *en banc,* especially where the defendant is a member of the bar whose reputation for honesty and integrity has never been questioned. Finally, in furthering the goal of proper and fair administration of justice and the appearance of fair play and justice, the CBA supports a rehear-

ing *en banc* and requests the Court to grant the Petition for Rehearing *en banc*.

Respectfully submitted,

Chicago Bar Association

/s/ Richard J. Phelan
President
Chicago Bar Association

/s/ Roseann Oliver
Chairman
Standing Committee on Litigation

Richard J. Phelan, Esq.
Roseann Oliver, Esq.
Phelan, Pope and John, Ltd.
180 North Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
312/621-0700